

Peer-review report of

Szebeni, Z., Elovainio, R., Martinović, M., Nijs, T., & Jasinskaja-Lahti, I. (2025). "(The story of) This country is ours!" The territorial and epistemic dimensions of collective psychological ownership among the national majority and immigrants. *advances.in/psychology*, 2, e753124. <https://doi.org/10.56296/aip00035>

Round 1

Dear Authors,

Thank you for submitting your important work, "Territorial and epistemic dimensions of collective psychological ownership among national majority and 2nd generation immigrants in Finland," to *advances.in/psychology*. I had the privilege of receiving reviews from two experts in the field. Their feedback is exceptionally thorough, constructive, and detailed, and I express my gratitude for their insightful comments. Prior to reading their evaluations, I personally read and assessed the manuscript.

As you will observe, we all recognize numerous strengths in the current manuscript. The topic is timely and significant, you compare majority and minority perspectives, and the samples are extensive and quota-representative (although please see the comment later on that needs clarification). However, we have identified various areas in which the current work could be enhanced. I will refrain from repeating the Reviewers' comments here, as they articulate them with great clarity. Nevertheless, I kindly request that you submit a revised version that addresses all of their feedback. In addition to their points, please address the following. Please note that these points may partially overlap with those raised by the reviewers.

Broader Issues

1. Like both Reviewers, I share concerns regarding the diverging item wordings of measured constructs between the samples. For CPO-T, the majority sample assesses absolute ownership, while the minority sample assesses relative ownership. These appear to be substantively different concepts. To some extent, this issue also applies to items used to assess CPO-E. Other scales also exhibited significant differences. For instance, based on the example item provided, collective investment seems to use different wordings ("worked hard" vs. "contributed a lot"), which is not ideal for a multi-group study. Similarly, you did not specify what "we" referred to in "Collective responsibility" for minority groups, and it remains unclear how they interpreted this term. Consequently, a direct comparison of findings becomes less meaningful and also complicates the interpretation of the results. In a similar vein, in the introduction, you argue that different determination rights might have different roles in majority and minority groups. However, you are unable to test this hypothesis as you measure different constructs in both samples. **Therefore, I strongly suggest you change the format of the paper to first present Study 1 (majority) and then present Study 2 (minority).** In other words, both studies should have their own methods and results sections presented separately.

Additionally, they should have brief introductions and discussions that connect them and allow you to explain why wordings were changed in certain respects in Study 2.

2. As the Reviewers outline, the theoretical background for your conceptual model requires much more attention in the introduction. You should clearly explain why some variables were considered outcomes and others antecedents. Additionally, provide a rationale for why the ownership variables are considered mediators. What research supports this theoretical causal chain and allows for time-precedence and causal inference? Are there other models that are conceivable and should these be tested? Moreover, I would have liked to see at least one paragraph for each of your variables, describing what they involved and why they should be related to CPO facets. I also suggest that you formulate your statements more carefully when discussing "consequences" in the discussion, as the data do not provide information about causality. Similarly, please also avoid the phrasing of "effects of x on y."

Methods and Results

1. Please highlight that the samples were quota-representative already in the abstract, as this is a strength. If the minority sample was not representative due to selective dropout, please note this in the manuscript and describe how it differed from the population.
2. When you say the samples were "weighted to be representative," please clarify whether you mean they were quota representative or that statistical results in all analyses that follow were indeed weighted. This distinction is important.
3. Please explain in more detail why "other" as gender was excluded "for statistical reasons". I am sure it was justified, but some people might want to know more.
4. As mentioned by the Reviewers, please provide a breakdown of the ethnic composition of your minority sample. Given the substantial sample size, it would indeed be interesting to compare different migrant groups/regions.
5. Please provide the instructions that majority members read for items such as "The exclusive right to decide about matters that concern Finland." Otherwise it is not clear what their response reflects.
6. Comparing two education level scales with different measurement options by simply transforming one of the scales is not psychometrically appropriate. This issue will be resolved by reporting the studies separately.
7. You state that your study is strictly exploratory, but your pre-registration contains one hypothesis. Please adjust the wording accordingly and provide the hypothesis in the main text.
8. Please include the power analysis from your registration in the main text.
9. In Table 2, ensure that all factor loadings are presented.
10. Please explain why deltas (fit change) are only presented for CFI.

11. There are many guidelines for acceptable VIFs. Please cite the guidelines you rely on.
12. Whenever you state that a correlation is stronger for one sample, an equivalence test would be required (this may not be relevant anymore after splitting analyses as suggested earlier).
13. Please provide references for the R program and indicate the versions of the program and the libraries used.
14. Please always present exact p -values except for when under .001. Please provide 95% CIs for all estimates.
15. As one of the Reviewers mentioned, a visual presentation of the model in both the majority and minority samples would guide understanding substantially. Please provide these for both studies
16. Please make the code and data to reproduce the analyses available in a repository and provide a reference to it in the text. Also, upload the SOM/appendices to the same repository.

Registration and Deviation From it

1. In the registration, you mentioned that you would refer to it as a "registration" instead of a "pre-registration" because data had already been collected and partly analyzed. However, in the text, you describe it as a "pre-registration." Please use the term that you planned to use for consistency.
2. In the registration, if I didn't misunderstand, you state that there is one control variable in the analyses, but in the text, you provide two. It's not a problem to change your mind, but please be transparent about deviations from the registration. Generally, deviations could be summarized in a section in the methods titled "Deviations from Registered Analysis Plan."
3. You also seem to run different model comparisons than those registered (the second-order solution seemed not to have been registered – this model is also statistically almost equivalent to the correlated model because it absorbs the correlation through factors, as you mentioned). I suggest dropping this model entirely. If you decide to keep it, please provide the fit for the second-order model for minority participants as well (for some reason, it is missing).
4. You registered to report alphas for reliability, but you report omega. Please explain.

Linguistic Issues

1. Please review the entire manuscript and remove any unnecessary empty spaces and other punctuation errors.
2. Please capitalize and format headings in APA7 format. Please also format all statistics in line with APA7 (for instance, you need to italicize N , M , p , and SD

throughout; note, Greek letters should not be italicized – you sometimes italicize them currently). The same applies to scale endpoints, which should be in italics.

3. There are numerous incomplete references, unlisted references, and formatting inconsistencies throughout the reference list. Please address all points highlighted in the citation report provided in the following link:

[https://drive.google.com/file/d/1-](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1-F4zL5xYivmZ2x51uclCxziWv_JdhXRK/view?usp=sharing)

[F4zL5xYivmZ2x51uclCxziWv_JdhXRK/view?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1-F4zL5xYivmZ2x51uclCxziWv_JdhXRK/view?usp=sharing). Additionally, please ensure that all journal articles include DOI numbers in the correct URL format. The entire reference list should adhere to APA7 guidelines.

In summary, I would like to express my sincere gratitude once again for your significant submission. I believe that your work has strong potential, but I also recognize that some substantial revisions and additions will help to fully realize its impact. With this in mind, I kindly invite you to submit a revised manuscript within one month, that is, by March 2nd. Please submit your revision with an itemized overview of how you addressed each of our points. Given the many requests, you can use an extra 2,000 words for your revised submission.

Please do not hesitate to reach out if you have any questions or require further guidance during the revision process or should require more time. I am committed to working with you to ensure that your work makes a valuable contribution to the field.

Best,

Jonas R. Kunst

Reviewer 1:

I read this manuscript with great interest. It reflects many admirable qualities. The topic is interesting, the ideas represent a potentially novel theoretical contribution, complex concepts are presented commendably clearly, the analyses are sophisticated, and the findings are stimulating. However, I have a number of questions and comments about aspects of the manuscript and the research. While some of these can be addressed straightforwardly, some of the points are more substantive and potentially more challenging. Still, I think there is considerable promise in the work, and I recommend inviting a revision for further consideration.

The conceptual focus of the present manuscript on distinguishing “territorial and epistemic dimensions of collective psychological ownership” offers a potentially novel contribution, and the comparison of the responses between national majority respondents and immigrant respondents helps broaden the nature of the contribution. In general, I thought that the Introduction presented the rationale clearly and that the main hypotheses were logically developed (albeit exploratory). While I suspect that the authors purposely restricted their literature review to “collective ownership,” I think readers would benefit from more background on the psychology

of ownership – including “mere ownership” (see Bialek, Gao, Yao, & Feldman, 2023) – more generally. For example, the psychology of individual ownership helps to establish ownership as a fundamental psychological phenomenon, with systematic neural correlates. That literature documents the dynamics of ownership of both material and immaterial objects (De Dreu & van Knippenberg, 2005; Nikander et al., 2014; Toma et al., 2013). While the authors may want to highlight the distinction between individual and collective processes as they consider this additional literature, I believe that including this information will strengthen the authors’ case concerning territorial and/versus epistemic collective ownership and help readers appreciate the broader landscape of work on ownership.

I found the research generally skillfully designed and analyzed. Statistically, the steps in the scale development (e.g., making the case for separate territorial and epistemic dimensions, tests of invariance) were conducted in conceptually and analytically sophisticated ways (and preregistered for the majority-group sample). I also appreciated the authors making the results of relevant supplementary information available in Appendixes (but I did not have access to these Appendixes for my review). However, I do have some substantive comments about these aspects of the work.

One of my questions relates to the results reported to establish the distinctive dimension of territorial collective psychological ownership (CPO-T) and epistemic collective psychological ownership (CPO-E). In the section on Parallel Analysis, the authors indicate that “the analysis strongly supported a two-factor solution.” However, the eigenvalues for the two-factors were 4.01 and 0.30 for the majority-group sample and 3.99 and 0.43 for immigrant sample. Presumably, as suggested by Table 2, factor 1 (eigenvalues = 4.01 and 3.99) represents the CPO-T items, and factor 2 (eigenvalues = 0.30 and 0.54) reflect CPO-E items. I do not have expertise in this aspect of scale construction, but one conventional cut-off for identifying a factor in a typical factor analysis procedure is an eigenvalue > 1.00 . So, the incremental explained variance by the second factor/dimension (CPO-E) seems quite small. In the Measurement Model and Model Comparisons section, for the majority sample, the authors conclude that the separate but correlated model “demonstrated the best fit to the data (CFI = 0.962, TLI = 0.953, RMSEA = 0.043 [90% CI: 0.040, 0.046], SRMR = 0.041)”, the second-order model had very similar fit indices (CFI = 0.960, TLI = 0.952, RMSEA = 0.044), and the single-factor model only slightly poorer fit (CFI = 0.935, TLI = 0.923, RMSEA = 0.055). The authors note that the fit of the latter two models were “acceptable.” Also, the correlation between CPO-T and CPO-E reported in this section is quite high, .800. For the minority sample, the authors indicate, “both the separate but correlated factors model (CFI = 0.972, TLI = 0.966, RMSEA = 0.044 [90% CI: 0.041, 0.047], SRMR = 0.041) and second-order factor model showed excellent fit, while the single-factor model performed notably poorer (CFI = 0.911, TLI = 0.894, RMSEA = 0.077). Unlike in the majority sample, the Scaled Chi-Square Difference Test indicated no significant

difference between the separate factors and second-order models ($\Delta\chi^2(6) = 8.01$, $p = .237$). For theoretical parsimony and consistency with the majority analyses, we retained the separate but correlated factors model.” Thus, while I do think there is evidence here that there may be two separate factors, CPO-T and CPO-E, I do not see the case as compelling as the authors portray it in the present in the Results section and, importantly, in the interpretations they present in the Discussion section. My strong recommendation is to begin the Discussion by explicitly considering the case for the idea of separate CPO-T and CPO-E concepts, including the evidence for and against. I am fine with the authors drawing a conclusion, based on that evidence, that there are benefits of the two-factor conceptualization, but I think it is important that readers also be alerted to the alternative plausible interpretation based on the second-order model.

While I found the description of the analyses and findings up through the Parallel Analysis section to be appropriately detailed and clearly explained, the subsequent sections of the Results were much more difficult to follow. These sections require some revision. For instance, Tables 4 and 5, reporting correlations with latent variables for the majority sample and the minority sample are not mentioned at all in the current text of the manuscript. While a simple fix would be to move these two Tables to an Appendix, I believe that readers would find these results informative. My preference would be to have explicit explanation, walking readers through these Tables, in the Results section. The information relating to Structural Modeling is presented in more detail in the text and in Table 6, but it was difficult to follow. I recommend adding Figures that illustrate the pattern of relationships observed with respect to the proposed relationships between CPO dimensions, antecedents, and outcomes for majority and minority groups, identifying where the patterns are significantly different. These analyses are important for making the case why distinguishing between CPO-T and CPO-E – two highly correlated measures – is valuable. I believe that much of the information is already in this section, but it was challenging to grasp; it is not presented as effectively as it should be.

The other substantive concerns that I have about the Method and Procedure involved the comparisons between the majority and minority samples (key to hypothesis 3). One reservation I have about the emphasis on comparing the effects for the two groups is that the data were collected at different times: The data were collected for majority group in April, 2023, and for the minority group in April-May, 2024. Beyond the normal concerns I would have about potential history effects when comparing the results for two different groups with data collected a year apart, I worry that history effects may be particularly potent in this case given that data collection occurred during the Russia-Ukraine War and given the ethnicities of participants in the minority sample.

The second concern I have about comparing the results of the majority and minority samples is that, despite the impressive statistical evidence about the comparability of the CPO-T and CPO-E scales for the two samples, the content of the scales for the two groups was somewhat different in meaning. For the majority group, a sample item on CPO-E was, "The story of this country is the story of us, Finns"; for the minority group, a sample item was, "The story of Finland is not only a story of ethnic majority Finns, but also the story of people with diverse cultural backgrounds living in Finland." In this case, for example, the majority group considers only the contribution of Finns, while the minority group is asked about the contribution of diverse groups *relative* to Finns. While I suspect the authors recognized the impracticality of modelling questions for the minority group directly on items for the majority group (i.e., an item like "The story of this country is the story of us, diverse groups" might seem unrealistic to respondents), it seems like it could be possible to have items for the majority group be more directly comparative (e.g., "The story of Finland is more a story of ethnic majority Finns than the story of people with diverse cultural backgrounds living in Finland"), allowing basically the same items to be used for both majority-group and minority-group respondents. I suspect that one of the reasons for the different types of items for the two groups is that the data-collection for the minority group followed the data collection for the majority group.

While I feel that the issues I have raised about the majority-group and minority-group data collections and materials are important ones, I do NOT feel these represent a "fatal flaw." I do think that the manuscript, which does report these elements, should emphasize and expand on the potential impact of these issues in the manuscript. For example, the Introduction might note these points, and caution readers about the potential impact of them in any interpretation of direct comparisons of findings (e.g., in hypotheses 3). To highlight the issue and be a bit more conservative in the presentation of the Results, that section might be structured first with analyses for the majority group, then with a separate section for the minority group, and then followed by a section about "exploratory comparisons" between the majority group and the minority group. The Discussion also needs to more explicitly qualify the interpretations of these comparisons. I don't think that comparisons between the majority group and the minority group – which I find very interesting and suggestive – need to be abandoned. However, I do feel that they need to be placed into better perspective with more explanation about limitations and caution in interpreting the effects.

In summary, I believe that the research represented in this manuscript is interesting and promising; it has the potential to make a novel and useful contribution to the literature. However, I have concerns about some methodological, empirical, and interpretive aspects of the current manuscript. The work has many strengths, and I do not necessarily see these issues of concern as fatal flaws. However, I do believe that revision is needed for further consideration for publication. I suspect that the authors will be able to revise the work appropriately, but I reserve judgment at this

time and encourage the authors to revise and resubmit the work for further consideration.

PS. Very minor point: P. 4, 2 lines from bottom. Is there a missing reference from the text where it says, “()”?

Reviewer 2:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the manuscript, “Territorial and epistemic dimensions of collective psychological ownership among national majority and 2nd generation immigrants in Finland”. In this work, the author(s) introduce “Collective Epistemic Ownership” (CPO-E), a form of collective psychological ownership that captures perceived ownership over knowledge or narratives (rather than territories). The author(s) distinguish CPO-E from territorial ownership (CPO-T) in a robust test of how these dimensions manifest in Finnish majority and second-generation immigrant groups in Finland. As expected, CPO-T and CPO-E were distinct dimensions across both groups and correlated with specific “activators” of psychological ownership, perceived rights and collective responsibilities depending on group membership. The author(s) conclude by arguing for the need to distinguish territorial and epistemic forms of psychological ownership to fully elucidate how psychological ownership manifests in different groups.

I read this paper with great interest. The topic is certainly interesting, and the author(s) present a compelling set of results that establish the distinctions between CPO-T and CPO-E in the Finnish context. I also commend the author(s) for their commitment to open-science practices and for their clear explanations of the analytic approach, results, and contributions of their work. Overall, there is much to like about this manuscript. That said, I have some suggestions for how to improve this manuscript for potential publication.

Introduction:

1. First and foremost, I would strongly encourage the author(s) to situate their research in the Finnish context. Many of the claims made in the introduction are specific to Finland (and similar nations) and require some further information about the Finnish cultural context for international readers. For instance, some of their arguments for ownership among minority groups do not necessarily hold for those who have an Indigenous claim to the land. For example, Māori, First Nations peoples, and Native Americans are all ethnic minority groups in New Zealand, Australia/Canada, and the U.S. (respectively), but they have a claim to their lands as the Indigenous peoples. In these cases, both ethnic majority and minority groups may claim ownership primarily due to autochthony and investment, but for different reasons.

Likewise, the author(s) argue, “For instance, majority members' stronger historical presence might lead their territorial ownership claims to more strongly inform their sense of determination rights, while their perceived mastery of national narratives through CPO-E might foster a sense of responsibility for maintaining these narratives.” The idea that majority group members have a stronger historical presence is only relevant in nations where the majority group is considered Indigenous (or, at the very least, not a colonial power). Given that the authors refer to the migrant group as an ethnic minority group, I think an early discussion of the context of their sample would strengthen the manuscript considerably. This is especially important given that recent work discusses psychological ownership in postcolonial nations (so interested readers may need further information as to how this work fits within this more recent work and the broader psychological ownership literature).

2. There are also other claims in the introduction that would benefit from further development. For instance, how does ownership impact relations between Russian migrants and Finish majority group members? Why is CPO-E important in “diverse societies”, and what do the author(s) mean by “diverse”? I would argue that CPO-E is a dimension relevant to multicultural and bicultural societies certainly but also in colonial contexts where ownership can be contested on the grounds of both territory and knowledge/culture.
3. In the opening paragraphs of the “Activating experiences and consequences of collective ownership” section, the author(s) introduce three ownership activators (control, intimate knowledge, and investment), but the explanations for how these would impact collective ownership are quite difficult to follow. I would recommend a more structured explanation that defines each of these activators in further detail and explains explicitly how these activators relate to ethnic/civic/cultural citizenship and how they could impact CPO-T and CPO-E among majority and minority groups.
4. Relatedly, some points are vague and need further clarity - “resonating the theorisation on the different relevance of ethnic and civic or cultural citizenship” could be written in more concrete terms. Likewise, “Epistemic ownership of the cultural narrative is particularly intertwined with the group identity, thus calling to take a particular care of the collectively constructed narrative as a way to maintain, protect, or enhance the group self” is vague and needs clarify surrounding why ownership of the cultural narrative is linked to group identity, and why that would then lead to the protection of group interests”. In short, the introduction is missing the “why” component in some of the core explanations that drive the rationale for the study.
5. More generally, I would encourage the author(s) to consider how founders' ownership, specifically, might be a relevant form of territorial ownership. While the research on native territorial ownership is certainly more relevant to the Finnish context, I wonder if founders' ownership may also be relevant for the majority group (particularly given that Indigenous Sami peoples were on the

land prior to the formation of Finland). Some recent references that may or may not be helpful are listed below:

Selvanathan, H.P., Lickel, B. and Jetten, J. (2021), Collective psychological ownership and the rise of reactionary counter-movements defending the status quo. *Br. J. Soc. Psychol.*, 60: 587-609. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12418>

Scarborough, A., & Xu, X. (2025). Founder ownership and system-justifying beliefs in relation to perception toward Black Lives Matter and other social movements. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 25(1), e12452. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/asap.12452>

Method:

1. Regarding the sample of 2nd generation immigrants – Did the author(s) collect information on where parents migrated from? I ask because a white 2nd generation immigrant from a European country will have different experiences from a 2nd generation immigrant who is also a **racial** minority. If this information was not collected, I would encourage the author(s) to discuss this as a limitation of their work.
2. Measures of CPO: the questions asked to the majority and minority groups differ considerably in content. Asking minority groups whether they own the country “as much as ethnic majority Finns” implies a sense of joint ownership, which is different from perceiving your group as solely owning the country. There are similar problems with the CPO-E items. While this may certainly be applicable in the Finnish context – can the author(s) argue for a generalisable CPO-E facet if the measures differ in this way? If the author(s) disagree with me, that is obviously fine, but a justification for the differences here is warranted in the manuscript.

Results:

1. Please provide the criteria for model fit ahead of presenting the results in the manuscript – I noted these were included in the pre-registration, which is great to see, but this is important information to provide for readers in-text.
2. Please provide the model fit statistics for the second-order factor model for the minority group in-text.
3. Please provide exact p-values throughout (rather than “ $p < .05$ ”).

Discussion:

1. The author(s) do an excellent job explaining their results and what they may mean for studies of ownership. But I couldn't help but wonder about the implications of distinct paths to ownership for majority and minority groups –

do the author(s) have thoughts on how different patterns in ownership may contribute to intergroup conflict, particularly in relation to multiculturalism/migration?

2. While I certainly think the findings are interesting and provide an important contribution to studies of psychological ownership, I believe some of the limitations mentioned here warrant more attention than is currently given. See my comments above r.e. the cultural context and how this may (or may not) generalise in other contexts, as well as my comments regarding the 2nd generation migrant sample.

Some more minor comments:

- Further explanations for how dominant groups shape cultural narratives (and how this may then foster a sense of epistemic ownership) would strengthen the argument for why CPO-E is important to distinguish from CPO-T.
- Related to above, I would like to see a bit more discussion of the distinctions between CPO-T and CPO-E – is there any research that suggests one can emerge without the other, for example (theory, qualitative work, etc.)? This is a minor point, but I'm interested to know whether any work has hinted at this possibility.

Round 2

Dear Authors,

Thank you for submitting your revised manuscript. I received feedback from the same two reviewers and thank them for another round of thorough work. I have also conducted my own independent evaluation before reading the reviews. We all acknowledge the significant improvements from the previous version. The clearer introduction and the restructuring into two distinct studies have made the complex findings much more accessible. Your research is clearly original and societally important.

However, further revisions are still necessary before publication. While one reviewer has only a single suggestion, the other has provided several important recommendations that require your careful attention. Additionally, I have identified several issues that need to be addressed. **I should note that several of these points were raised in the previous review but appear to have been overlooked in your revision, even though your revision letter suggested they had been addressed.** Please be advised that all these issues must be fully addressed in your next submission, as it will form the basis of my final decision. I kindly ask that you

ensure no further oversights occur, as this will be the final opportunity for extensive revision before determining the manuscript's publication status.

Stylistics Issues

- Your manuscript still requires significant alignment with APA7 formatting guidelines. The current deviations from the standard are substantial and need to be addressed with care. I kindly request that you carefully review and adjust the formatting throughout the document to ensure full compliance with APA7 standards before resubmission.
- The line spacing is irregular and not in line with APA7.
- As requested earlier, please italicize statistical notation including *p* values, *Mean*, *N*, *R*², and *SD* (except Greek letters) throughout the manuscript, including in all tables. Ensure proper spacing between "*p*" and "=" or similar operators. Although you previously confirmed that scale endpoints (e.g., "*strongly agree*") had been italicized, this formatting is still missing in the current version.
- Your headings continue to deviate from APA7 guidelines. Please carefully revise all headings to follow APA7 capitalization rules and formatting requirements throughout the manuscript.
- Please review and correct all table and figure titles and captions to ensure they adhere to APA7 formatting standards. The current formatting is inconsistent with APA7 guidelines in several instances.
- Please present all confidence intervals in the standard APA7 format: 95% CI [-.185, -.027] (i.e., include "95% CI " before the brackets for all reported confidence intervals throughout the manuscript).
- Please carefully reorder the references in your reference list according to APA7 guidelines, which prioritize alphabetical ordering followed by chronology. There are several entries that don't follow this pattern, along with some incorrect publication years and other inconsistencies. Note that some issues flagged in the report may be false alarms due to slight variations in author name spelling. For your convenience, the full citation report can be accessed here:
https://drive.google.com/file/d/1fUjcDU8xI3ZSv0_NbznUjsRX1JjS_Eva/view?usp=sharing
- Please remove all bold formatting from tables.
- Please avoid starting sentences with numerals, as in "96.3% (*n* = 1193) self-identified as Finnish..." Instead, either spell out the number at the beginning of a sentence or restructure the sentence to place the numeral elsewhere (e.g., "Participants who self-identified as Finnish comprised 96.3% (*n* = 1193) of the sample..."). This adjustment should be made throughout the manuscript where it applies.

- Replace all instances of "SM" with "SOM" throughout the manuscript, defining it at first use as "Supplementary Online Materials." Upload these materials to an OSF repository (preferably the same one where your data and code are stored) and include the link in the text. All references to "Appendix" should be changed to "SOM," with relevant files placed in the appropriate repository.
- Ensure consistency in punctuation marks throughout the manuscript. Currently, there is variation between straight and curly quotation marks ("" vs. "") and apostrophes. Please carefully standardize these throughout the document.
- Add all figures as high-resolution SVG files to the word file to ensure optimal quality and clarity.
- When introducing model fit indicators for the first time, spell them out completely before using the acronym (e.g., "Comparative Fit Index (CFI)" rather than just "CFI").

Linguistic Issues

- Please conduct a thorough proofreading of the entire manuscript to address the numerous typos, missing words, and punctuation errors throughout. Using an AI tool like Grammarly may be helpful for this purpose. Specific examples that need correction include but are not limited to:
- Correct "collective control beingalong with investment".
- Fix the redundancy on p. 1 ("from studies on CPO CPO studies")
- Add the missing word in "(for exception, see Brylka et al., 2015)" to read "(for an exception, see Brylka et al., 2015)" or similar
- Remove all double spaces throughout the manuscript
- Correct "an (sic) mean age" to "a mean age"
- While CPO-T and CPO-E acronyms are helpful, please avoid creating acronyms for other constructs (e.g., "CINV", "CIK") as they make the text difficult to follow
- You use acronyms in one correlation table but not the other. Ensure consistency.
- Eliminate all contractions (e.g., "hasn't") throughout the manuscript in accordance with APA7 style
- Add the missing word "that" in "...adding an epistemic dimension into the analysis of collective ownership over the country provides a more nuanced framework can better capture the full complexity of group-based ownership perceptions"
- Remove the colon at the end of the heading "Parallel Analysis (PA) and Model Comparisons:" Generally, do not end any headings in this way.

Methods and Results

- Thank you for including the "Deviations from registration and analytical approach" section. Please relocate this section from the end of the introduction to the end of the methods section where it will be more appropriately placed.
- As previously requested, please create two figures representing the estimated SEM mediation models (one for each study), including estimates, *p* values, and preferably 95% CIs. Once these figures are provided, the direct effect estimates can be removed from the tables to improve readability and reduce their current extensive nature.
- To improve the efficiency of your correlation tables, please numerate the variables in the first column and use these numbers in the upper row instead of repeating the variable names. The APA7 manual provides excellent examples of this format.
- Please include a demographic breakdown of the largest ethnic groups in the minority sample as previously requested. This information is essential for understanding who participated in your study.
- Important: Avoid repeating statistical information in the text that is already provided in figures or tables. Instead, describe the relationships conceptually and direct readers to the relevant table or figure for specific statistical details. This will significantly reduce the current text flow.
- Please ensure consistency by providing R^2 values for both Study 1 and Study 2, not just for Study 1.
- The purpose of testing additional models that separately examine effects of CPO-T and CPO-E is unclear. Since your paper's core premise is that both are factorially distinct with good fit to the data, you should primarily report the model that includes both variables simultaneously. If these additional tests are for robustness, please explain this briefly in the text but move the results to the SOM.
- When stating that certain relationships are stronger than others (e.g., "CPO-T exhibited a stronger association with Exclusive Determination Rights ($\beta = 0.330$, $p < .001$, [.188, .445]) compared to CPO-E ($\beta = 0.186$, $p = .028$, [.022, .394])"), please test these comparisons directly using constraints to substantiate such claims.
- The second reviewer asked you to provide model fit criteria (i.e., cutoffs etc.) in text. You confirmed that this had been done, but such criteria and their references are not present in the text.
- I requested you to provide citations for the software and libraries you used and their versions. You confirmed that this had been done, but they are nowhere to be found in the main text. This should be placed in the Analysis section of your Methods section.

Discussion

· Regarding your response to Reviewer 1's previous comment, there appears to be a discrepancy. While you confirmed "we have revised the Discussion section to begin with an explicit consideration of the evidence for and against the two-factor conceptualization," the current Discussion section does not start with this discussion. Please revise the Discussion to open with a thorough examination of this issue, including: a clear discussion of the factorial findings, of the high correlations between the two constructs, how correlations with antecedents and consequences support or challenge the distinctiveness of the two constructs, and thus a balanced weighting of evidence both for and against the two dimensions being distinct. As Reviewer 1 noted, while it is appropriate to conclude in favor of their distinctiveness, this position must be presented with proper nuance and acknowledgment of contradictory evidence. Please ensure this critical analysis appears at the beginning of your Discussion section.

I appreciate your careful attention to these revisions. Making these changes will significantly strengthen your manuscript and prepare it for potential publication. Please submit your revised manuscript within 30 days (May 4, 2025), accompanied by a detailed response letter addressing each point raised in this round of reviews. Please provide excerpt demonstrating the changes directly in the letter. Given that several issues from the previous round were not addressed, please carefully revisit each of the previous points as well and confirm in the letter that they have been addressed.

I look forward to receiving your revised manuscript and believe that addressing these issues thoroughly has the potential to result in a valuable contribution to the field. If you have any questions about these requested revisions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Best,

Jonas R. Kunst

Reviewer 1:

I have reviewed the revised version of the manuscript, "(The story of) this country is ours! Territorial and epistemic dimensions of collective psychological ownership among national majority and 2nd generation immigrants in Finland" (AIP346). I found the authors' letter describing the changes to be very helpful. I appreciate the effort the authors devoted to revising the manuscript in line with the guidance they received in the original round of review. Overall, I found this version much stronger, clearer about many key aspects of the work, and more compelling. I continue to believe that the focus of the research is valuable, both theoretically and practically,

and that the results are informative. The restructuring of the manuscript into Study 1 and Study 2 allows the authors to address several of the issues that concerned me about the original version of the work. I am thus generally supportive of this version of the work for publication – but with a few additional revisions.

While the current manuscript includes changes to better comply with APA 7th Edition guidelines were made in response to specific points made in the original reviews, the manuscript still deviates from APA guidelines in several aspects, such as having “Introduction” rather than the title on the first page of the narrative, as well lines a paragraph spacing. Also, the capitalization in the headings is inconsistent with APA guidelines, and the line spacing in the references does not conform to APA guidelines.

There were also places in the manuscript where I felt that particular, more substantive issues merited more consideration and explanation.

I found the additional information about the Finnish context helpful. However, I also wondered whether there have been historical territorial disputes between Finland and Russia that would allow Russian immigrants an opportunity to claim territorial ownership as well as ownership based contributions to the society.

In the first paragraph under “Present research,” I recommend adding a sentence or two succinctly reminding readers about how the current work goes beyond the existing literature on collective ownership.

Given that a central contribution of the current work is the development of scales reflecting different types of collective ownership, I recommend including the final set of items for CPO-T and CPO-E be included in tables in the main text to make them directly accessible to readers.

I found the Discussion of Study 1 to mainly be a list of findings just reported. I do think it is useful to highlight those results given the complexity of the results reported. I also understand that the General Discussion will return to these findings. Nevertheless, I recommend that the authors expand their discussion of the novel contribution of Study 1, which is now mentioned in the final sentence of that section, to better explain the theoretical and practical significance of Study 1. A single paragraph would probably suffice. This is important to sustain readers’ interest to help speak to the larger goals of the research.

Similar to my comment about the Discussion of Study 1, I note that the Discussion of Study 2 is mainly a listing of the most important results of that study. I recommend adding a paragraph to the Discussion of Study 2 that explaining the new contribution of Study 2 to the existing literature. Again, I recognize that the General Discussion follows, but the independent contributions of each study should be identified in the respective Discussion sections, and then the General Discussion can synthesize the findings, explanations, and implications.

In the General Discussion, I also recommend adding a paragraph (probably before the Limitations heading) explaining the overall new contribution of the research,

describing how it is different from and advances previous research on collective ownership, and what it adds to broader theory.

In general, while I commend the authors' responsiveness to the points raised in the initial round of reviews, the important specific details added to the revised manuscript seem to come at the expense of bigger-picture consideration of how the current research is situated in the landscape of the existing literature on ownership and collective ownership more specifically and how the present work extends psychological theory. I believe that this work makes novel contributions; my concern is that the current version does not sufficiently address that important aspect of research. I urge the authors to take a step back and add material to the latest version of the work to identify and explain those broader contributions.

A few additional, minor points:

Five lines from the bottom of the first page of the narrative, CPO is repeated in a sentence: "CPO CPO".

Use of contractions should be avoided: "narratives where they're underrepresented".

The line spacing in the paragraph under the heading "Implications of collective psychological ownership" is different than the other paragraphs. That also applies to the first paragraph under Study 1. Please check formatting throughout.

Reviewer 2:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the revised manuscript, "(The story of) this country is ours! - The territorial and epistemic dimensions of collective psychological ownership among national majority and immigrants". I was pleased to see this back on my desk!

I greatly appreciate the author(s) considered responses to my suggestions for revision, as well as the responses to the other reviewer and the Editor. In particular, the author(s) did a great job situating their research in the Finnish context (and the broader psychological ownership literature) and providing a stronger argument for the pathways to CPO-E among immigrant and majority groups.

These revisions, coupled with the revised two-study structure and discussion, have greatly improved the quality of the manuscript. As such, I have no further suggestions for revision.

One **minor** point, however – please capitalise Indigenous when referring to Indigenous peoples or groups. It may seem like a nitpick, but the capitalisation is a sign of respect and differentiates discussions of Indigenous peoples from general discussions of indigeneity. This is something that can be resolved in the proofing stage, so (in my view) does not constitute a revision.

Congratulations to the author(s) on a great paper; I look forward to citing this manuscript in future work.